

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/738,234

Applicant(s)  
Roberts et al.

Examiner  
Clark F. Dexter

Group Art Unit  
3724

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Keith Haupt

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Clark Dexter

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 5, 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 26-31

Identification of prior art discussed:

Schafer

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:


The 35 USC 112 rejections were discussed as well as language to obviate those rejections. Additionally, Applicant's position regarding the prior art rejection is that while a counter top per se may be obvious, the prior art does not teach or suggest the synergistic or unique relationship between the dispenser and the counter top of the claimed invention. Regarding claim 30, applicant's position is that Schafer does not disclose a front wall portion and a rear wall portion which are both hingedly coupled to a housing. Mr. Dexter's position is that, as best understood, Schafer's device has a front portion and a rear portion that are both part of the housing and hingedly coupled to each other and thus Schafer is considered to meet the claim limitation. Mr. Dexter stated that if claim 30 was clarified to define that the front portion and the rear portion each have their own separate hinge connection to another portion of the housing, that such appears that it would define over Schafer.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
CLARK F. DEXTER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3724